



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

down the current critical theory. He claims to have no interest at all in attributing the Pentateuch to Moses. But he does maintain that it is more just to ask what single passages are *not* from Moses, than timorously here or there to attribute to him a broken fragment. The whole temper and tone of the book is strongly against the current critical position both of the Pentateuch as a whole and especially that of Deuteronomy.

SCHMIDT, AAGE. *Gedanke über die Entwicklung der Religion auf Grund der babylonischen Quellen.* [Mitteilung der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft (E.V.), 1911, 3.] Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1911. 136 pages. M. 5.

The characteristics of some of the old religions of the ancient world are depicted in *Die Entwicklung der Religion auf Grund der babylonischen Quellen*. To make comparisons more valuable the author presents some facts concerning the development of religion among the Egyptians, the Chinese, the Greeks, the Phoenicians, the Indians of India, and the Babylonians. Of the last he specifies the Sumerians and the Babylonians as two different facts. As a kind of summary of his investigation we may say that there is an important difference between the content of the Sumerian and Babylonian texts. On the whole and in the long run, Sumerian texts are certainly older than Babylonian, and since we have a unified culture before us as we must surely assume, we find two steps in the development. By comparison we find, first, that the old, great judicial deities have been promoted to the side of lower divinities; second, that magic and enchantment grew and became more and more senseless and finally secured a recognized place in the native religion. Both of these peculiarities are paralleled at the same time among neighboring peoples, except that in China the process was slower. Comparative religion finds some material here.

EERDMANS, B. D. *Alttestamentliche Studien.* IV. Das Buch Leviticus. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1912. 144 pages. M. 4.40.

The Book of Leviticus contains almost entirely laws to regulate the cult. Chaps. 8-10 are narrative, but link themselves to Exodus, chaps. 25-40. Bertholet, in the introduction to his commentary on Leviticus, says, "Leviticus belongs entirely to P; to this there is no dissent." Eerdmans challenges this statement, and undertakes in his discussion to set it aside. After we have followed the author through his detailed study of phrases, customs, laws, and literary form, we find that his conclusion is that almost all the laws contained in Leviticus are pre-exilic. There is no real occasion for finding in the book an exilic code of laws, the so-called "laws of holiness." It cannot be proved that Lev., chap. 17, begins a new collection of laws, and it is not probable that Lev., chaps. 1-7 and 11-16, are to be ascribed to a later date than chaps. 17-26. If we compare Lev., chap. 11, with Deuteronomy, it appears that Lev., chap. 11, is the older text.

The author's methods deserve careful study and thought before we can set them aside. In the comparisons made in chaps. 1-7, he certainly has a strong case in his favor. While Eerdmans repudiates the results of the Wellhausen critics, he largely uses their methods. But his careful use of archaeological material, and his comparative study of rites and customs, bespeak impartial consideration for the validity of his conclusions.